

**Ser.no. 09/982,930**  
**Amdt dated November 4, 2005**  
**In Reply to Office Action dated June 6, 2005**

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 to 16 and 18 to 19 as being unpatentable for obviousness and as not complying with 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US Patent No. 4,616,891 to Jantzen ("Jantzen") in view of US Patent No. 4,259,755 to Hollander ("Hollander") and US Patent No. 5,458,409 to Sheng ("Sheng").

Applicant has amended claim 12 to more clearly define the tab. Claim 12 is now directed at:

A container unit, comprising a housing having opposing side walls, and a plurality of bins mounted between said side walls for rotation between closed and open positions, such that in said closed position, outer faces of said bins are generally coplanar, and in said open position, said outer faces each angle outwardly from said housing, thereby providing access into said bins, said bins being connected together for movement in unison, said outer faces occupying substantially all of a front portion of said housing,

said housing further comprising connection means configured to engage connection means of a housing of another container unit and a tab extending upwardly from an upper surface thereof having an opening for hanging said container unit **said tab being connected to said upper surface via a living hinge** (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references when read separately or together disclose, suggest, teach or obviate the added subject matter. By connecting the tab via a living hinge, added advantages are experienced. One such advantage is that the tab may then be folded, when necessary, such as when the container unit is installed in the holder. Furthermore, the living hinge allows the tab to be easily removed, when required.

Claims 21 and 22 have been amended to replace the term "tool box" with the term "holder". New claim 23 has been added.

Jantzen describes a storage cabinet having multiple storage compartments which all move together in unison if one of the compartments is opened or closed. The storage cabinet may also be hung on a wall via a handle 150. Hollander discloses the subject matter of storage bins

**Ser.no. 09/982,930**  
**Amdt dated November 4, 2005**  
**In Reply to Office Action dated June 6, 2005**

being connected together for movement in unison to form a support for a bed. However, Hollander is directed at an article of modular furniture and not towards multiple compartment storage bins. Sheng is directed at a container having multiple moving drawers. The drawers are all inter-connected so that the opening of one drawer causes the other drawers to open and similarly with the closing of one of the drawers.

Applicant respectfully believes that Applicant's invention is patentable over Jantzen in view of both Hollander and Sheng. A review of Jantzen shows that the storage cabinet is not designed to be mounted or installed into a holder, such as a tool box. The storage cabinet of Jantzen is designed to be a stand alone unit. Therefore, there is no need for the tab to be connected via a living hinge. As disclosed at column 3, lines 43 to 47, "The support frame 110 defines a vertical unit or cabinet, adaptable either to rest on the ground or on a piece of furniture, or to be hung on a wall, or to be readily transported if fitted with a handle and/or wheels". From this description, Applicant respectfully submits that one would not contemplate installing this storage cabinet in a holder, such as a tool box. Applicant respectfully submits that Hollander and Sheng are quiet about the subject matter of a tab being connected to said upper surface via a living hinge so as not to interfere with installation of said container unit in a holder. Retraction of Examiner's rejection of claims 12 to 16, 18 and 19 is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jantzen in view of US Patent No. 4,401,350 to Fortune ("Fortune"). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection is now moot in view of the amendments outlined above. As claim 20 is dependent on amended claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentable over the cited art as Applicant respectfully submits that Fortune does not disclose the subject matter which Applicant regards as patentable. Retraction of Examiner's rejection of claim 20 is respectfully requested.


Claims 21 and 22 have been rejected as being unpatentable for obviousness and as not complying with 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over US Patent No. 4,616,891 to Jantzen ("Jantzen") in view of US Patent No. 5,803,254 to Vasudeva ("Vasudeva"). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection is now moot in view of the amendments outlined above. As claims 21 and

**Ser.no. 09/982,930**  
**Amdt dated November 4, 2005**  
**In Reply to Office Action dated June 6, 2005**

22 are directly or indirectly dependent on amended claim 12, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21 and 22 are patentable over the cited art as Applicant respectfully submits that Vasudeva does not disclose the subject matter which Applicant regards as patentable. Retraction of Examiner's rejection of claims 21 and 22 is respectfully requested.

We look forward to further communication on this application.

By:

  
Jeffrey W. Wong  
Registration No. 46,414  
Attorney for Applicant

**Borden Ladner Gervais LLP**  
100 Queen Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1P 1J9  
Telephone: (519) 741-9100  
Fax: (519) 741-9149  
e-mail: [jwong@blgcanada.com](mailto:jwong@blgcanada.com)

IP-KIT-1123139/1